

**Remarks**

Applicants would like to expand on the remarks filed in the 8/27/03 response with respect to the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and with respect to the incomplete references noted by the Examiner.

**Section 112 Rejections**

In the Office Action of 5/22/03, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 10 pursuant to the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, alleging that these claims are indefinite.

The rejection of claim 10 was withdrawn in the Advisory Action.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner continues to assert that the term “high” is relative and that no definition of this term has been supplied. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The term “high velocity oxy-fuel spraying” is a term of art, understood by one of ordinary skill, and the word “high” is simply part of the name of this well known technique. High velocity oxy-fuel spraying is a thermal spraying technique that was first developed in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Referring to this technique is no more ambiguous than referring to techniques such as “cold” welding or “hot” isostatic pressing. Simply using the term “high” does not make a claim indefinite. Instead, the claim should only be rejected if there is some ambiguity about the claim’s scope. In this case, high velocity oxy-fuel spraying is understood in the art, and one of ordinary skill can determine its scope.

Applicants submit that claim 6 fully complies with 35 U.S.C. §112 and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw rejections based upon on 35 U.S.C. §112.

**Cited Prior Art**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for including an updated copy of PTO form SB08 with the Advisory Action. A notation on the form indicates that complete copies of the two EP references have been submitted, but does not state whether a complete copy of US Pat. No. 4,137,619 has been received by the USPTO. To clarify the record, a new Information Disclosure Statement containing complete copies of all three references has been submitted with


this supplemental response.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the Amendment and Response entered with the RCE and the above remarks, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: October 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By   
\_\_\_\_\_  
William C. Geary III  
Registration No.: 31,359  
NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP  
World Trade Center West  
155 Seaport Boulevard  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604  
(617) 439-2766  
(617) 310-9766 (Fax)  
Attorneys for Applicants

1263883.1